UNITED NATIONS

General Assembly

FORTY-EIGHTH SESSION

Official Records

FIRST COMMITTEE
27th meeting
held on
Tuesday, 16 November 1993
at 3 p.m.
~~New York~~

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 27th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. von WAGNER (Germany)

CONTENTS

DECISIONS ON DRAFT RESOLUTIONS SUBMITTED UNDER ALL DISARMAMENT AND INTERNATIONAL SECURITY ITEMS (continued)

This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned within *one week of the date of the publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room DC2-794, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate corrigendum for each Committee.

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.1/48/SR.27
19 January 1994
ENGLISH
ORIGINAL: FRENCH

93-82426 (E)

The meeting was called to order at 3.30 p.m.

DECISIONS ON DRAFT RESOLUTIONS SUBMITTED UNDER ALL DISARMAMENT AND INTERNATIONAL SECURITY ITEMS (continued) (A/C.1/48/L.8/Rev.2, L.9, L.13/Rev.2, L.15*, L.23, L.26/Rev.2, L.37, L.44/Rev.1, L.48 and L.51)

Draft resolutions A/C.1/48/L.23, L.26/Rev.2, L.37, L.44/Rev.1 and L.51

Introduction (or withdrawal) of the draft resolutions

1. Ms. MASON (Canada), introducing draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.44/Rev.1, said that among the original sponsors were countries which in the past had been unable to support even a procedural text on the prohibition of the production of fissile material for weapons purposes. She was particularly grateful to the delegations of the United States and India for their assistance in the drafting of a text which could command the support of the whole international community and be adopted without a vote. The title of the item had been amended to reflect more accurately the subject-matter of the proposed treaty. The heart of the draft resolution lay in paragraph 1 which recommended the negotiation in the most appropriate international forum of a non-discriminatory, multilateral and internationally and effectively verifiable treaty banning the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices. The text did not specify the forum or a time-frame for negotiation of the treaty. Canada would like to see the negotiations take place as soon as possible, for the first priority was to ensure the successful launch of the negotiations on a comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty.

2. Mr. CHANDRA (India) said that his delegation was happy to become a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.44/Rev.1. The most appropriate international forum for negotiation of a treaty was the Conference on Disarmament, and the negotiations ought to begin at an early date. India did not think that the proposed treaty could have an adverse effect on civilian nuclear programmes.

3. Two major elements of draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.23 submitted by India, i.e. a comprehensive ban on the testing of nuclear weapons and the complete cessation of the production of fissile material for military purposes, had been satisfactorily covered by two separate draft resolutions of which India was a sponsor; India therefore withdrew draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.23 in order to avoid any redundancy in the Committee's work.

4. Mr. KAMAL (Pakistan), introducing draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.37, said that until nuclear weapons were completely eliminated the non-nuclear-weapon States must be provided with legally binding assurances that such weapons would not be used against them. The draft resolution was based on General Assembly resolution 47/32, which had been adopted by an overwhelming majority, and it appealed to all States to work actively towards a common formula which could be included in an international instrument of a legally binding character in order to ensure the security of non-nuclear-weapon States. It was to be hoped that the draft resolution would enjoy the widest support in the Committee.

5. Mr. KANTOLA (Finland) said that his delegation supported draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.44/Rev.1, for it thought that a treaty banning the production of fissile material for military purposes would strengthen the existing non-proliferation instruments. An effective verification system, with responsibility entrusted to the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), ought to be the central element of the treaty. The Conference on Disarmament was the most appropriate forum for the negotiations. The nuclear Powers would clearly have special responsibilities in the negotiations, in which IAEA should participate. Finland was ready to take an active part in the process, which the international community should launch in 1994.

6. Mr. CALOVSKI (former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia), introducing draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.26/Rev.2, said that the self-explanatory changes made in the text were the outcome of fruitful consultations between interested delegations. In the first line of paragraph 3 in the English text, the article "the", inadvertently placed before the words "Balkan States", should be deleted.

7. The CHAIRMAN, introducing draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.51, thanked all the delegations which had participated in the drafting of the text. The aim was to restructure the Committee's annual agenda on the basis of the thematic approach described in paragraph 2. He was willing to continue his consultations on the rationalization of the Committee's work with a view to improving the effectiveness thereof, as he was requested to do in paragraph 3 of the draft resolution, which he hoped could be adopted without a vote.

Draft resolutions A/C.1/48/L.8/Rev.2 and A/C.1/48/L.9

Decisions on the draft resolutions

Draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.8/Rev.2

8. Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee) announced that the list of sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.8/Rev.2 entitled "Bilateral nuclear-arms negotiations and nuclear disarmament" should now read: Australia, Bolivia, Finland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, France, Honduras, Indonesia, Japan, Marshall Islands, New Zealand, Norway, Russian Federation, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and United States of America.

9. Draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.8/Rev.2 was adopted without a vote.

Draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.9

10. Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee) announced that the list of sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.9 entitled "Amendment of the Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and Under Water" should now read: Brunei Darussalam, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Gabon, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Kazakhstan, Malaysia, Mexico, Mongolia, Nepal, Nigeria, Peru, Philippines, Rwanda, Senegal, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Thailand, United Republic of Tanzania and Venezuela.

11. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.9.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Israel, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Turkey.

12. The draft resolution was adopted by 99 votes to 3, with 40 abstentions.

Draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.44/Rev.1

13. Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee) said that the mistake in paragraph 4 of the Spanish text would be corrected. He announced that the list of sponsors of the draft resolution entitled "Prohibition of the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices" should now read "Australia, Austria, Belarus, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Cameroon, Denmark, Finland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, India, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Panama, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Sweden, United States of America and Uruguay.

14. Draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.44/Rev.1 was adopted without a vote.

Explanation of position after the decision

15. Mr. DANIELI (Israel) said he had joined the consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.44/Rev.1 on the principle that a prohibition on the production of fissionable material for military purposes subsumed the notion of a freeze on nuclear weapons in the Middle East. However, the specific modalities for the implementation of such a resolution could not be addressed in isolation from the peace process, in all its aspects, or from global action to reduce tension and limit armaments.

16. Ms. DUNCAN (New Zealand), supported by Ms. MASON (Canada), said that her country and Australia were deeply committed to the cause of nuclear disarmament and had very much regretted having to abstain in the vote. However, the text of the draft resolution, in particular the preamble, did not faithfully reflect the substance of the discussions which had taken place and the conclusions which had been reached at the latest meeting of the States parties to the Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and under Water.

17. Mr. LEDOGAR (United States of America) said he had voted against draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.9 because he did not think that a conference to amend the partial test-ban treaty was the appropriate venue for negotiations on a comprehensive test-ban treaty. Furthermore, the fact that some of the provisions of the resolution implied a lack of confidence in the Conference on Disarmament as a forum for negotiations on a comprehensive test-ban treaty was not likely to promote the success of the exercise.

18. Mr. BERDENNIKOV (Russian Federation) said that he had abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.9 because he thought that it should be possible to adopt a single consensus resolution on the question of nuclear-weapon tests; that would be the best way to resolve the problem of the test ban within the framework of the Conference on Disarmament. The situation with regard to the amendment of the 1963 Treaty had totally changed since the Conference on Disarmament had reached agreement that negotiations on a comprehensive nuclear test-ban treaty would be initiated. There was no justification for continuing the parallel process of amending the 1963 Treaty, since that process would divert attention from the negotiations within the Conference on Disarmament and gave the illusion that there was a realistic alternative to those negotiations. There was, in fact, no alternative, for two reasons. First, amending the 1963 Treaty could not lead to a comprehensive test ban since it did not affect two nuclear Powers which were not parties to it. Second, under the provisions of the 1963 Treaty, such an amendment could not be adopted because all the initial parties to the Treaty were not in agreement on the subject. The Amendment Conference had already played its part, and all attention should now focus on negotiations for a comprehensive test ban within the framework of the Conference on Disarmament.

19. His delegation had supported draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.44/Rev.1 because it had always favoured the conclusion of an internationally verifiable treaty on the prohibition of the production of fissionable material for nuclear weapons or other explosive nuclear devices. It thought that negotiations on such a treaty should be undertaken within the framework of the Conference on Disarmament, the only forum for multilateral negotiations in the field of disarmament. It regretted that paragraph 1 of the draft resolution contained the imprecise - not

(Mr. Berdennikov, Russian Federation)

to say ambiguous - phrase "the most appropriate international forum"; that phrase was subject to misinterpretation and could lead to an unjustifiable delay in the launching of the negotiations, especially since previous General Assembly resolutions on the subject dealt explicitly with the problem of the prohibition of the production of fissionable material for weapon purposes within the framework of the Conference on Disarmament.

Draft resolutions A/C.1/48/L.13/Rev.2 and A/C.1/48/L.37

Explanation of vote before the vote

20. Mr. NEAGU (Romania) said that he would vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.37 because his country attached great importance to the conclusion of effective international arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons. The best safeguard would obviously be general and complete nuclear disarmament but, pending the attainment of that goal, it was necessary to strengthen the non-proliferation regime.

21. International arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons should take the form of a binding international agreement, which should provide both positive and negative security assurances and should ensure the equality of all States which renounced the acquisition of nuclear weapons.

22. To circumvent the difficulties of devising a universally acceptable common formula, it would be useful to envisage several approaches, such as those put forward within the Conference on Disarmament. At all events, the climate seemed favourable for the adoption of an international instrument on the subject, as illustrated by the fact that the five nuclear Powers were now parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. However, no headway could be made in the negotiations unless both the nuclear-weapon and the non-nuclear-weapon countries were willing to show a greater degree of flexibility and mutual understanding.

23. Sir Michael WESTON (United Kingdom) said that his delegation would, as in previous years, abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.37. It would do so because the draft resolution did not establish the necessary relationship between the assurances required of the nuclear Powers and a legally binding commitment on the part of non-nuclear-weapon States not to acquire or produce nuclear weapons, a commitment which they could make by acceding to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons.

24. Mr. O'SULLIVAN (Australia), speaking also on behalf of Canada and New Zealand, said that he would vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.37 because he believed it was imperative to ensure the security of non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons. He emphasized, however, that non-nuclear-weapon States should show proof of their commitment to the cause of nuclear disarmament by acceding to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and other relevant regional agreements. The question of negative security assurances could not be considered in isolation from efforts to strengthen the international nuclear non-proliferation

(Mr. O'Sullivan, Australia)

regime. For that reason he would have liked the draft resolution to be more explicit with respect to the obligations of non-nuclear-weapon States.

25. Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee) announced that the list of sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.13/Rev.2, entitled "Convention on the Prohibition of the Use of Nuclear Weapons", should now read: Algeria, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Bolivia, Colombia, Costa Rica, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mexico, Sudan and Viet Nam.

26. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.13/Rev.2.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Ukraine, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Hungary, Iceland, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Slovakia, Spain, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Estonia, Georgia, Greece, Ireland, Israel, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Malta, Marshall Islands, New Zealand, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Slovenia, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia.

27. Draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.13/Rev.2 was adopted by 102 votes to 21, with 23 abstentions.

28. Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee) said that the list of sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.37, entitled "Conclusion of effective international arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons", should now read: Bangladesh, Colombia, Costa Rica, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Madagascar, Nepal, Pakistan, Panama, Sri Lanka, Sudan and Viet Nam.

29. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.37.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: None.

Abstaining: France, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

30. The draft resolution was adopted by 142 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

Explanations of vote after the vote

31. Ms. DUNCAN (New Zealand) said that she had abstained during the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.13/Rev.2 because she did not find the wording satisfactory, even though she shared the goals set forth in it. Specifically, the draft Convention on the Prohibition of the Use of Nuclear Weapons annexed to the resolution would not, in her delegation's view, make a practical

(Ms. Duncan, New Zealand)

contribution to the nuclear disarmament process. New Zealand believed that only the total elimination of nuclear weapons could provide a certain guarantee in that area and it would therefore continue to focus its efforts on the adoption of practical measures which would promote the attainment of that goal.

32. Mr. KANTOLA (Finland) said that he had voted against draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.13/Rev.2 because the text seemed to him to be too far removed from current realities. The end of the cold war had in fact significantly reduced the risks of a generalized nuclear war. For that reason, the efforts of the international community with regard to nuclear disarmament should focus mainly on non-proliferation.

33. Mr. O'SULLIVAN (Australia) said that he had abstained during the vote because the adoption of a Convention on the Prohibition of the Use of Nuclear Weapons could have implications for the maintenance of strategic stability based on deterrence. Australia would, however, support a single binding no-first-use assurance by the nuclear-weapon States.

34. Mr. ERRERA (France) said that France had always had reservations regarding the resolution in question. He recalled that, at the previous session, France had deliberately changed its position and voted in favour of resolution 47/50 in the hope of placing the discussion concerning negative assurances on a new basis since the five nuclear Powers were now all parties to the NPT. France had also wished to encourage the sponsors of the draft resolution to take account of the fact that there was no consensus regarding the possibility of negotiating a binding legal instrument and establishing a connection between security assurances made to non-nuclear-weapon States and a binding legal commitment on their part not to acquire or produce nuclear weapons such as that found in the NPT. Having noted that its appeal at the forty-seventh session had not received a response, France had decided, regretfully, to abstain during the vote at the current session.

35. Mr. HU Xiaodi (China) said that, although his delegation believed that some of the wording in the draft resolution could be improved further, it had decided to vote in favour of it since the draft Convention annexed to it could be taken as a useful basis for negotiations towards the attainment of a complete prohibition on the use of nuclear weapons.

36. Mr. BANDURA (Ukraine) said that, as a country which had inherited a large quantity of nuclear weapons following the break-up of the former USSR, Ukraine understood very well the need for steps to protect non-nuclear-weapon States against the use of such weapons. Ukraine warmly welcomed the efforts of the Conference on Disarmament and other United Nations organs to find a formula that would be acceptable to all non-nuclear-weapon States and believed that the draft resolution would advance that process. In particular, he emphasized that the lack of legally binding assurances was one of the principal obstacles to the creation of a denuclearized world in which States would refrain from establishing their own nuclear arsenals. The negotiations which Ukraine was actively conducting with a view to implementing the agreements already concluded did not always produce the desired results for the very reason that no satisfactory solution to the problem had so far been found at the international

(Mr. Bandura, Ukraine)

level. For that reason, Ukraine had joined the consensus that had emerged on the question and had voted in favour of the draft resolution.

Draft resolutions A/C.1/48/L.15* and L.48

37. Mr. EL TINAY (Sudan) introducing draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.48, said that the sponsors had taken into account the realities of the post-cold-war era and the positive developments which had occurred in the region, in particular the signing of the Declaration of Principles between the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) and Israel. Having said that, however, Israel should not take advantage of the agreement - which was but one stage along the road towards the establishment of a just and comprehensive peace - to disguise the fact that negotiations with the Arab countries of the region were at an impasse as a result of Israel's categorical refusal to withdraw from the occupied Arab territories which it had taken by force in 1967.

38. Citing official Israeli statements, he asserted that Israel could also not hide the fact that it had nuclear weapons. In that context, he had been surprised to note that the Israeli delegation had subordinated the question of the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons to the question of the Middle East peace process when, at each session of the General Assembly, a resolution had been adopted calling upon Israel to renounce possession of nuclear weapons and accede to the Non-Proliferation Treaty. After intense consultations, the Arab countries had maintained that the draft resolution should be worded in such a way as to obligate all the States of the region to place all their nuclear facilities under International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) safeguards. Since the text of the draft resolution was quite different from that of previous resolutions on the subject with respect to both form and content, he urged that it should be adopted.

Explanations of vote before the vote

39. Mr. LEDOGAR (United States of America) welcomed the fact that the sponsors had sought to make many positive changes to draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.15*, although he regretted that some of the most important rights and freedoms of navigation had not been dealt with in the text. Indeed, while the sixth preambular paragraph reaffirmed the freedom of navigation in the high seas, no mention was made of the freedom of overflight, the right of innocent passage through the territorial sea, the right of transit passage through straits or the right of passage through archipelagic waters. The United States therefore felt constrained to vote against the draft resolution.

40. Mr. AL-ATTAR (Syrian Arab Republic) said that the submission of draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.48 was justified because Israel continued to refuse to place its nuclear facilities under IAEA safeguards, thus threatening the security and stability of the countries of the region and of the entire world. The draft resolution was in line with the wishes expressed by the international community since it committed Israel, like other States of the region, to renounce its nuclear option and to place its nuclear facilities under IAEA safeguards. In so doing, Israel would be demonstrating that it sincerely sought a way to bring the peace process in the Middle East, which had not yet achieved

(Mr. Al-Attar, Syrian Arab Republic)

the desired results to a conclusion. It would also reassure the other countries of the region.

41. It should be emphasized in that regard, that those who called for the establishment of regional arrangements with a view to monitoring nuclear weapons in the Middle East appeared to forget that there could be no cooperation under the shadow of occupation and annexation and when the rights of others were being denied and the resolutions of competent international authorities remained unimplemented. They also behaved as if they did not recognize that it was the responsibility of the United Nations to maintain international peace and security, which was its raison d'être.

42. Mr. GUILLAUME (Belgium), speaking on behalf of the members of the European Union, said that the introduction of draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.48 was all the more untimely in that with the signing of the Israeli-Palestinian peace agreement in Washington the Middle East peace process had taken a decisive turn. The Twelve also deplored the singling out of a particular country, since the risk of the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction in the Middle East was a problem that should be dealt with in a global manner within the framework of the peace talks. It should be recalled in that connection that that was the aim of the Mubarak plan, which had the support of the entire international community. The Twelve shared the aim of establishing a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East and urged all the countries of the region, including Israel, to accede to the Treaty on Non-Proliferation and to place all their nuclear facilities under IAEA safeguards. Moreover, the issue of the presence of weapons of mass destruction in the region should be dealt with in the framework of the Middle East peace talks.

43. The vote of the members of the European Union should be understood, therefore, as both an appeal to leave the past behind, and a clear message of support for the negotiations under way in the framework of the Middle East peace process.

44. Mr. O'SULLIVAN (Australia) said his delegation would vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.15*, as its tone and language had undergone a marked adjustment in the right direction. It was apparent from the 1993 report of the Ad Hoc Committee, however, that no concrete result had been achieved in regard to the development of new approaches to peace and security in the Indian Ocean region. It was to be hoped that all the interested States would contribute to the report to be prepared by the Secretary-General in implementation of the resolution.

45. Mr. BERNHARDSEN (Norway), speaking on behalf of the Nordic countries on draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.48, said that the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East could be brought about only if the countries of the region acted in a spirit of cooperation. In order to establish a climate of confidence, therefore, all the countries of the region should accede to the Treaty on Non-Proliferation and place all their nuclear facilities under IAEA safeguards. In that connection, the singling out of a particular country was a practice that should be eschewed, particularly in view of recent events in the region.

Action on draft resolutions

Draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.15*

46. Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee) said that draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.15*, entitled "Implementation of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace", was sponsored by Indonesia, on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, Panama and the Philippines.

47. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.15*.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: France, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Norther Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey.

48. The draft resolution was adopted by 110 votes to 3, with 32 abstentions.

Draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.48

49. Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee) said that draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.48, entitled "Israeli nuclear armament", was sponsored by Bahrain, Djibouti, Egypt, Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Mauritania, Morocco, Oman, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates and Yemen.

50. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.48.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Chad, China, Colombia, Comoros, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Egypt, Guinea, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Morocco, Niger, Oman, Pakistan, Philippines, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zimbabwe.

Against: Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Kenya, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Spain, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Argentina, Australia, Bahamas, Belarus, Benin, Brazil, Cambodia, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chile, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cyprus, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Gabon, Georgia, Ghana, Guyana, India, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Lesotho, Mexico, Mongolia, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Samoa, Singapore, Suriname, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Ukraine, Uruguay, Zambia.

51. The draft resolution was adopted by 55 votes to 39, with 47 abstentions.

Explanations of vote after the vote

52. Mr. TUN (Myanmar) said that the proliferation of nuclear weapons would not only considerably increase the risk of nuclear war but would also constitute a threat to national, regional and world security. He had always supported efforts to strengthen the non-proliferation regime, and found it encouraging in that respect that more than 155 States, including the five nuclear Powers, were now parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, which was the cornerstone of that regime. To put an end to the danger of nuclear proliferation, Myanmar urged all those States which had not yet done so to accede to the Treaty and conclude full safeguard agreements with IAEA. His delegation did not think that a resolution directed specifically at a single country, such as the one just adopted, helped to realize the aim in view, and it had therefore abstained in the vote.

53. Mr. BANDURA (Ukraine) said that his country, as a supporter of the principle of the inadmissibility of resort to nuclear weapons and bearing in mind the need to act to stop them spreading, had always backed efforts at the

(Mr. Bandura, Ukraine)

international level to prevent any Government suspected of wishing to acquire such weapons from doing so. However, given the clearly discriminatory approach of the draft resolution - reminiscent of a recent past when confrontation between the blocs had led to the submission of various draft resolutions intended to obtain not concrete results but rather ideological dividends - his delegation had been obliged to abstain in the vote.

54. Mr. CHANDRA (India) said that his delegation's position was unchanged and that, while it continued to support all efforts for the total elimination of all nuclear weapons as part of a world approach, and the establishment of peace and security in the Middle East, it had been obliged to abstain in the vote because it found the singling out of one particular State on that issue inappropriate. If the vote had been taken paragraph by paragraph, his delegation would have voted against operative paragraph 1.

55. Mr. FRIER (Israel) said that the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.48 should reflect the position, favourable or otherwise, of the First Committee towards the Middle East peace process. His delegation regretted to see therefore that certain States had sponsored the resolution or voted in favour of it; it hoped that those which had abstained would alter their position over time and warmly thanked those States which, faithful to their convictions, had voted against it.

56. Mr. MORADI (Islamic Republic of Iran) said he had voted for the draft resolution because he was convinced that what were called, in the third preambular paragraph, the "recent positive developments" in the situation would not lead to the full restoration of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people. Moreover, he thought that as long as Israel's nuclear weapons were not eliminated from the face of the earth the item "Israeli nuclear armament" ought to stay on the First Committee's agenda.

57. Mr. MARSCHIK (Austria) said that his country had always supported all efforts to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons, particularly in the sensitive area of the Middle East. It had always demanded that all countries of the region should adhere to the NPT and place their nuclear activities under IAEA safeguards. Although it had supported draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.35, therefore, his delegation had voted against draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.48: its substance seemed to have been already covered by draft resolution L.35 and its adoption might have been interpreted by some countries in a way that could have adversely affected the climate of the Middle East peace negotiations.

58. Austria attached great importance to the peace process in the Middle East, which in recent months had shown encouraging developments; in particular, the work of its working group on arms control and regional security, in which Austria was participating, was proceeding satisfactorily. A delicate point had been reached and everything should be done to facilitate the peace process in the quest for a just and lasting peace in the Middle East.

59. Mr. GÜVEN (Turkey) said that by reason of its geographical location his country attached great importance to the preservation of peace and security in the Middle East. It therefore encouraged all States in the region to adhere to the international instruments on the non-proliferation of weapons of mass

(Mr. Güven, Turkey)

destruction. It took every opportunity to call not only on Israel but on all States of the region to accede to the NPT and to place all their nuclear facilities under IAEA safeguards. It believed that practical steps to that effect would make an important contribution to dissipating the climate of distrust inherent to the region. Turkey had, however, abstained at the current session in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.48, which it believed did not cover all the components of the problem relating to nuclear non-proliferation in the Middle East. It would have preferred a text which underlined the responsibility of all the countries in the region to promote nuclear non-proliferation, thus contributing to the maintenance of peace and security in the Middle East.

60. Mr. NEAGU (Romania) said that at the previous two sessions of the General Assembly his delegation had voted against the draft resolution on "Israeli nuclear armament", since it believed it was high time to adopt a new, more constructive approach to the problem of nuclear non-proliferation in the Middle East, in accordance with the positive developments in the relations between States in the region over the previous few years, and especially taking into account the recent breakthrough in the Arab-Israeli peace negotiations. The historic agreement of 13 September 1993 opened up new possibilities for peaceful coexistence and collaboration, not only between their two peoples, but among all the peoples in the region.

61. He was also encouraged by the consensus registered on the proposal for the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region. A further positive element was the decision to establish an arms control and regional security working group to deal with the sensitive issue of Middle East arms control. His delegation had noted with great interest that the United Nations was working with the group as an extraregional participant.

62. Romania's vote against the draft resolution took into consideration those important positive elements and was conceived as a constructive effort to support the peace process in the Middle East and thereby the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons in the region and around the world.

63. Mr. O'SULLIVAN (Australia) said that the past year had seen a substantial improvement in the security climate in several parts of the world, including the Middle East, where there were good prospects that the agreement between Israel and the PLO would stimulate further progress towards peace in that region. The Middle East working group on arms control and regional security had continued to do constructive work, in which Australia had been pleased to participate.

64. His country had consistently urged Israel and other States, both parties and non-parties to the NPT, to live up to the standards of international behaviour set out in the Treaty. It appealed to the few remaining States which had not yet done so, particularly those that operated unsafeguarded nuclear facilities, to join the Treaty.

65. Australia's abstention on the vote on the draft resolution should not be interpreted as anything less than complete support for the calls that Israel should join the NPT and accept complete safeguards on all its nuclear facilities. His country fully shared the concerns expressed in the resolution

(Mr. O'Sullivan, Australia)

and supported the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone and a zone free of weapons of mass destruction in the Middle East.

66. Mr. GAJDA (Hungary), speaking also on behalf of Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Poland and Slovakia, unreservedly associated himself with the statement of the representative of Austria.

67. Mr. GURECKAS (Lithuania) had voted against draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.48 for the same reason as the representative of Hungary and associated himself with the latter's statement.

The meeting rose at 5.40 p.m.

UNITED NATIONS

General Assembly

FORTY-EIGHTH SESSION

Official Records

FIRST COMMITTEE
28th meeting
held on
Thursday, 18 November 1993
at 10 a.m.
New York

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 28th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. von WAGNER (Germany)

CONTENTS

CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS SUBMITTED UNDER ALL DISARMAMENT AND INTERNATIONAL SECURITY ITEMS (continued)

This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of the publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room DC2-794, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate corrigendum for each Committee.

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.1/48/SR.28
7 January 1994

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

93-82486 (E)

The meeting was called to order at 10.35 a.m.

CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS SUBMITTED UNDER ALL DISARMAMENT AND INTERNATIONAL SECURITY AGENDA ITEMS (continued)

1. Mr. SVOBODA (Czech Republic) said that his delegation welcomed and supported the proposal by France and Sweden for a conference to review Protocol II to the Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May Be Deemed to Be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects (the inhumane weapons convention). It shared the concern expressed in the Committee with regard to the indiscriminate use of anti-personnel mines particularly in internal conflicts, a practice which seemed to be increasing in Eastern Europe. As only 35 countries had so far acceded to the Convention, his delegation was in favour of the early convening of the proposed review conference, which, in addition to providing an opportunity for a closer examination by the international community of the use of anti-personnel mines, booby traps and similar weapons, could draw attention to the Convention and its purposes. Input could also be sought from experts of countries which had not acceded to the Convention, and for that purpose some of the conference's subsidiary bodies might be open-ended.

2. Ms. MASON (Canada), introducing draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.45/Rev.1, noted that it drew attention to the continuing impact of changes in the international environment on the question of verification and called for an in-depth examination by a group of experts of the lessons of recent United Nations verification experience and other relevant international developments with regard to verification. Her delegation strongly believed that efforts to strengthen the non-proliferation, arms control and disarmament mechanisms, including verification, could play a valuable role in a new international order and that the United Nations must be central to such efforts. One area in which important work could be done was in exploring the ways in which verification could contribute to conflict management and confidence-building by the United Nations. In recent years, more and more United Nations peace-keeping forces had been mandated to perform disarmament-related tasks including verification. Moreover, new practical experience in weapons-related fact-finding and on-site inspections was being acquired in a variety of contexts. Most of those activities were being planned and conducted on an ad hoc basis. Given those new developments and new emphasis, a follow-up study on verification could provide a useful opportunity to learn from recent experience and to develop ideas for future efforts in that area.

3. The focus of verification questions was also changing. Much more attention was now being given to non-proliferation and arms control in regional, local and even intra-State situations. An examination of how the tools of verification could most usefully be employed in those contexts, what new methods and approaches might be needed, and how verification and compliance-monitoring could contribute to the broader goals of maintaining peace and security were among the questions such a study could address. In Canada's view, the proposed study was entirely consistent with the draft resolution on compliance with arms limitation and disarmament agreements (A/C.1/48/L.47) which had been adopted by the First Committee earlier in the week and offered a practical means of contributing to the objectives set out in that draft resolution.

(Ms. Mason, Canada)

4. Many delegations had asked what the effect of the proposed new study would be on the set of 16 verification principles developed by the United Nations Disarmament Commission and endorsed by the General Assembly in 1988. It was Canada's view that those principles remained valid; at the same time, however, it was appropriate to explore whether additional principles and guidelines might be needed to address the new requirements of the present-day world. The proposed study could examine such possibilities and make suggestions, which could then be referred to a global forum such as the Disarmament Commission for further consideration.

5. It was important to view verification as a process with a variety of informational inputs. Different sources of compliance-related information and different monitoring methods could provide complementary data that could make overall verification stronger and possibly more cost-effective. That too was an area where a follow-up study might contribute usefully.

6. Reviewing the conclusions of the 1990 Group of Experts did not mean duplication of work but, on the contrary, building upon that earlier work. Learning from recent developments could add to the results of the 1990 study and broaden the understanding of Member States in ways that would pave the way for more meaningful deliberations on the appropriate role of the United Nations in the field of verification.

7. It was also important to undertake the study because of a fragmentation of views which had appeared among previously like-minded countries on the subject of verification and the role in it of the United Nations. That difference of views extended even to the definition of verification, with some States seeking to distinguish between verification and compliance-monitoring. In Canada's view, a follow-up study could help bridge that gap between views and provide a foundation for an enhanced consensus on the subject.

8. Mr. KAMAL (Pakistan), introducing draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.36 on regional disarmament, said that the global and regional approaches to disarmament were complementary and should be pursued in tandem. Moreover, there was increasing appreciation of the fact that the regional approach to disarmament was an essential element in the search for disarmament and peace, and that the security problems of States needed to be given further consideration in a regional framework. The Heads of State or Government of the Non-Aligned Movement had recognized, at their tenth summit meeting in 1992, that security problems were region-specific and were best addressed within an appropriate regional context.

9. Using the guidelines formulated by the Disarmament Commission earlier in 1993 as a starting-point, a sincere effort had been made to merge draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.36 with the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/48/L.28. The effort had been unsuccessful because essential concepts contained in the two draft resolutions could not be assimilated in a single text. The sponsors of the first draft resolution would be ready to work for a merger by the next session of the General Assembly, on the clear understanding that there should be no dilution of the core concepts contained in either draft resolution merely for the sake of achieving a merger.

(Mr. Kamal, Pakistan)

10. Draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.36 largely followed the lines of General Assembly resolution 47/52 J, which had received overwhelming support in the General Assembly in 1992, and its co-sponsors hoped it would receive as much or more support in 1993.

11. Introducing draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.38/Rev.1, he said that it was clear that arms races and conflicts in various parts of the world were being fuelled not by global disputes but by regional discord and tensions between States, and that conventional arms control measures must therefore be vigorously pursued at the regional and subregional levels in the interests of lowering tension. Moreover, although conventional arms control measures had been initiated in many areas, they had been disappointingly limited in scope and impact. A major reason for the lack of progress at the regional level was that concerned parties were usually unable to agree on basic principles which should govern negotiations on the issue. The best way to encourage meaningful negotiations on regional arms control was therefore to develop widely accepted principles on the basis of which talks might be held. The Conference on Disarmament, which was the single multilateral negotiating forum and worked on the basis of consensus, was well situated to do that. Draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.38/Rev.1 incorporated those ideas and proposals and would no doubt give a much needed impetus to negotiations on conventional arms control at the regional and subregional levels. Its sponsors therefore hoped that the Committee would give it the broadest possible support and that follow-up action would subsequently be taken on it in the interests of both regional and international peace and security.

12. Mr. GONZALEZ (Mexico), speaking in support of draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.45/Rev.1, said that verification in all its aspects had been a significant concern of the international community, and it was his delegation's belief that the role of the United Nations in verification should be strengthened, particularly in view of the changed international situation. The draft resolution was modest in scope and pointed in the right direction. His delegation urged all representatives to support it.

Draft resolutions in cluster 6

Draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.31/Rev.1

13. Mr. MEHR (Afghanistan) said that at the request of another delegation, it had been agreed that the title of draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.31/Rev.1 submitted by Afghanistan should be amended to read: "Measures to curb the illicit transfer and use of conventional arms". For the sake of consistency, the third preambular paragraph should also be amended along those lines. In the interest of rationalizing the work of the Committee, further consultations had been held with a view to consolidating the two draft resolutions on international arms transfers, which in the view of his delegation, were identical in substance. However, the sponsors of the two draft resolutions (A/C.1/48/L.27/Rev.1 and L.31/Rev.1) had been unable to reconcile their positions, although they had finally agreed that the two texts were complementary. In conclusion, he informed the Committee that Cambodia had also become a sponsor of the draft resolution and expressed the hope that it would be adopted without a vote.

14. Mr. GALEANO (Paraguay) requested that his country's name be deleted from the list of sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.31/Rev.1.

15. Mr. RIVERO (Cuba) regretted that it had not been possible to reach agreement on the consolidation of the two draft resolutions in question. In the view of his delegation, draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.27/Rev.1 was broader in scope and summarized the issues at stake in a more balanced fashion than draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.31/Rev.1. If the delegation of Afghanistan insisted that action be taken on its draft resolution, a number of amendments would be advisable. Firstly, the word "developing" should be deleted from the fourth preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 2. Moreover, the latter should be further amended to the effect that the Secretary-General should seek the views of Governments on effective ways and means for collecting illegally distributed weapons in the countries which so requested.

16. Mr. PONCE (Ecuador) said that draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.27/Rev.1, of which his country was a sponsor, sought a comprehensive solution to the problem of illicit arms trafficking and suggested that the matter should be taken up in an appropriate forum, namely the Disarmament Commission. The draft resolution submitted by the delegation of Afghanistan dealt with only one side of the issue and laid too great an emphasis on the situation of developing countries, whereas illicit arms trafficking was a problem common to all regions. He therefore endorsed the amendments to draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.31/Rev.1 proposed by the Cuban representative.

17. Mr. NGO DINH KHA (Viet Nam) also expressed support for the amendments proposed by the representative of Cuba.

18. Mr. DANKWA (Ghana) endorsed the amendments proposed by the representative of Cuba; in its present form draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.31/Rev.1 was discriminatory, since it implied that arms were illegally distributed in developing countries only, which was certainly not the case.

19. Mr. GONZALEZ (Mexico) expressed support for draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.31/Rev.1, as orally amended by the Cuban representative.

20. Mr. NKURLU (Tanzania), referring to the addition to paragraph 2 proposed by the Cuban representative, suggested that in the English version it would best be rendered: "in those countries which so request ...".

21. Mr. GALVEZ (Peru) endorsed the oral amendments to draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.31/Rev.1 proposed by the representatives of Cuba and Tanzania respectively.

22. Following a discussion in which Mr. RIVERO (Cuba) and the CHAIRMAN took part, Mr. MEHR (Afghanistan) proposed that action on draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.31/Rev.1 should be deferred, pending consultations among delegations on the various amendments proposed.

23. It was so decided.

Draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.27/Rev.1

24. Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee) announced that Kenya, Spain, Trinidad and Tobago, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Zimbabwe had joined the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.27/Rev.1.

25. A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: None.

Abstaining: United States of America.

26. Draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.27/Rev.1 was adopted by 143 votes to 0, with 1 abstention.*

---

* The delegation of Afghanistan subsequently informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour.

Announcement of sponsorship

27. Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee) announced that the following delegations had become sponsors of the draft resolutions listed: A/C.1/48/L.32: Malta; A/C.1/48/L.40: Burundi, Comoros, Kuwait, Mauritania, Niger and Seychelles.

Draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.42

28. Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee) said that the delegations of Azerbaijan, Cameroon, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Greece, Guyana, Iceland, Israel, Latvia, Lesotho, Malta, Marshall Islands, Federated States of Micronesia, Panama, Rwanda, Slovakia, Slovenia and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia had joined the sponsors of the draft resolution.

29. Mr. ZIADDIN (Bangladesh), Mr. ANOH (Côte d'Ivoire), Mr. VALENZUELA (Honduras), Mr. ATABEKOV (Kyrgyzstan) and Mr. TAAPOPI (Namibia) requested that the names of their delegations should be included among the list of sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.42.

30. Draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.42 was adopted without a vote.

Explanations of vote or position

31. Mr. WESTON (United Kingdom), explaining the position of his delegation and that of France on resolution A/C.1/48.L.42, said they strongly supported international action on the indiscriminate laying of non-self-destructing mines. However, Protocol II to the inhumane weapons convention permitted self-destructing or self-neutralizing anti-personnel mines as legitimate forms of self-defence if directed at military targets. Possession of those mines should not be restricted to countries with the capacity to manufacture them because they did not fall within the scope of the resolution.

32. Mr. LEDOGAR (United States of America), explaining his delegation's vote on draft resolution A/C.1/48.L.27/Rev.1, said that the revision of the draft resolution had precluded his Government's support for it, in that operative paragraph 4, as revised, would prejudice the decision about adding a new item to the 1994 agenda of the Disarmament Commission. His Government likewise rejected the expansion of the United Nations register of Conventional Arms to include illicit arms traffic; that was inappropriate and unfeasible, since such transfers were by nature secret and not reportable in a register format.

33. Mr. HU Xiaodi (China) said that had there been a vote on draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.42, his delegation would have abstained. His Government understood the desire to avoid the killing of civilians by land mines, but oversimplified measures limited to halting the export of those weapons could not solve the problem. Since it was the legitimate right of States to obtain weapons for self-defence, his Government could not support the draft resolution.

34. Mr. KVOK (Russian Federation) said that his Government had supported the consensus adoption of draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.42 on humanitarian grounds, and on the understanding that the moratorium would not affect the export contracts already concluded nor deliveries of mines for use by Russian troops

(Mr. Kvok, Russian Federation)

stationed in other countries with the consent of those countries, or deliveries of anti-personnel mines to countries with which his Government had entered into treaties on collective security.

35. Mr. BANDURA (Ukraine), speaking in explanation of position on the draft resolutions contained in cluster 6, said that in resolving problems related to arms transfers account must be taken both of the need to maintain international peace and security and of the economic and foreign policy interests of all States. A positive attitude should be taken to arms supplies when they promoted self-defence and participation in regional or other collective measures stemming from decisions of the United Nations or other international bodies. At the same time, reliable multilateral barriers to arms exports were needed in cases where such exports would promote continuation of armed conflicts, regional destabilization support of international terrorism or interference in the affairs of sovereign States. Adoption of decisions on arms exports was the prerogative of competent national bodies, with the exception of Security Council decisions on specific sanctions. Controversial issues relating to arms exports should be resolved through bilateral or multilateral consultations. His Government had instituted a tight system of export controls. Its policy was in line with the provisions of the resolutions in cluster 6, and his delegation had therefore supported them.

36. Mr. SELVAGGI (Italy), explaining his delegation's position on draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.42, said that after the adoption by the Italian Parliament in 1990 of one of the world's strictest laws on arms transfers, his country's arms exports had been reduced by half. The draft resolution was a positive step towards banning the export of anti-personnel land mines, and his delegation had therefore voted in favour of it. Further multilateral discussions were needed to define more precisely which types of arms should be subject to export restrictions. The forthcoming Conference to review the Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons could be the appropriate forum for discussion of that matter.

37. Mr. KAMAL (Pakistan), said that though his delegation had joined the consensus resolution A/C.1/48/L.42 on humanitarian grounds, but believed it had shortcomings, had prevented Pakistan from becoming a co-sponsor. The moratorium on export addressed the supply side of the anti-personnel mine problem, but did not tackle the issue of stockpiling, use and production. That could lead to a monopoly of the use of those weapons by a few countries, an inequitable and inherently flawed arrangement. His delegation would have preferred a more comprehensive approach to the issue of uncleared anti-personnel mines, including training measures for concerned countries, measures to improve mine-clearance technology and strengthening of legal norms for mine use. Issues relating to self-neutralizing mines should also be considered. He urged the sponsors to submit to the General Assembly next year more comprehensive and balanced measures.

38. Mr. GOONETILLEKE (Sri Lanka) said although his delegation had supported the draft resolution, it was concerned by several unresolved problems. The resolution introduced a moratorium on the export of anti-personnel mines, but did not deal with production and use. Moreover, it was designed to prevent Governments which had legitimate reasons for doing so from importing such mines,

(Mr. Goonetilleke, Sri Lanka)

whereas experience showed that mines were often used indiscriminately by non-State entities such as falling into the hands of militant groups. Nor did the resolution address the problem of local manufacture and use of names by militant groups, and the moratorium might also encourage Governments to manufacture anti-personnel mines locally. His delegation hoped that in future the Committee would address those broader issues.

39. Mr. GONZALEZ (Mexico) said that his delegation had supported draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.42 because it was a step in the direction of the ultimate prohibition of anti-personnel mines and their destruction. However, the resolution attempted to solve only part of the problem, ignoring the stockpiling of such mines. In his delegation's view, the most effective way of dealing with the issue would be international agreement on legal instrument of universal scope prohibiting the manufacture of mines and providing for the destruction of stockpiles. That objective would best be achieved by revising Protocol II to the inhumane weapons convention.

40. Mr. SHOUKRY (Egypt) said his delegation had participated in the consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.42, although it would have preferred a fuller treatment of the subject. Export restrictions alone would not achieve the desired results, and echoing the comments of several other delegations, he said that a resolution dealing with the production and use of anti-personnel mines would have been preferable. It was also important that the moratorium on exports should not obstruct the legitimate concerns of Governments with regard to self-defence.

41. Mr. DANKWA (Ghana) said that his delegation had supported the consensus adoption of draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.42 on humanitarian grounds. However, he wished to reiterate one of his Government's basic policy positions: peace-building in the post-cold-war era should not mean some States could be entrusted with weapons while others could not. Non-discrimination was a basic factor in the maintenance of peace. Moreover, it would have been preferable for the resolution to cover the production, use and stockpiling of anti-personnel mines, as well as their export.

Draft resolutions in cluster 10

42. Mr. ZALVAR (Brazil), speaking in explanation of vote before the vote, said that the guidelines of the Disarmament Commission on regional approaches to disarmament within the context of global security were balanced and forward-looking, and his delegation had expected the General Assembly to build on the solid ground they provided. Regrettably, however, neither the letter nor spirit of those guidelines had been fully reflected in the Committee's work. A single draft resolution which could have been approved by consensus would have been preferable to the three texts now before the Committee.

43. His delegation, while supporting draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.28, would have preferred to see the balance achieved at the 1993 session of the Disarmament Commission retained in the text. Any document addressing regional disarmament issues should thoroughly reflect the Commission's agreed principles, particularly principles 13, 18, 25 and 30.

(Mr. Zalvar, Brazil)

44. Draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.36 repeated almost exactly the text of resolutions approved by recorded vote in previous years, without taking recent developments fully into account. His delegation would have preferred a merger with draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.28.

45. Draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.38 ran directly counter to the Disarmament Commission's guidelines and recommendations: his delegation would therefore abstain in the vote on it.

46. Mr. HOFFMAN (Germany) said that the main purpose of draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.28 was to endorse the guidelines and recommendations on regional approaches to disarmament adopted by consensus in the Disarmament Commission and that his delegation regarded it as a true merger of all resolutions introduced in the Committee in previous years on regional disarmament. Accordingly, no additional resolution on the subject was needed, and his delegation was therefore not, as it had been in the past, a sponsor of the text contained in draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.36. However, it had no major difficulties with its contents and would vote in favour of it.

47. His delegation welcomed the operative part of document A/C.1/48/L.38/Rev.1, and would vote in favour of the draft resolution as a whole. However, it had serious doubts as to the compatibility of the fifth and sixth preambular paragraphs and with the guidelines for regional approaches to disarmament adopted by the Disarmament Commission. It was questionable whether the fifth paragraph contributed to the cooperative spirit of all partners: responsibility for regional security was indivisible, and should not be relegated to particular States. The sixth preambular paragraph singled out an objective of conventional arms control which would not necessarily improve security. A principal objective for conventional arms control in that context should be equal security for all partners at the lowest possible level of armaments. If the two paragraphs were voted on separately, his delegation would therefore vote against the fifth preambular paragraph and abstain on the sixth preambular paragraph.

48. Mr. CHANDRA (India) said that draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.38/Rev.1 was seriously flawed, since it failed to take account of the guidelines and recommendations for regional approaches to disarmament within the context of global security, which stipulated, inter alia: that regional arrangements for disarmament and arms limitation should be open to the participation of all States concerned and agreed freely among them on the basis of the principle of the sovereign equality of all States concerned and should take into account the specific conditions and characteristics of the region; that States participating in regional arrangements for disarmament and arms limitation should define the region to which the arrangements among them applied; that regional approaches to disarmament and arms limitation should take into account the necessity to address broader, non-military factors which might affect security; and that regional arrangements for disarmament and arms limitation should address in all its aspects the question of the accumulation of conventional weapons beyond the legitimate self-defence requirements of States.

(Mr. Chandra, India)

49. Not only were those ideas not mentioned in the draft resolution, but conceptually, it ran counter to them by approaching the issue on a narrow one-dimensional plane on which it could not possibly succeed, instead of holistically and within a broad political and military framework.

50. Moreover, in contending that States with larger military capabilities had a special responsibility for promoting such agreements, it ignored the fact that such States often had wider security problems and concerns and that each State must contribute equally to regional security to the maximum extent of its means.

51. His delegation, furthermore, could not accept the primacy of place in the disarmament agenda which the draft resolution appeared to give to conventional arms control. It believed that nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction posed the most serious threat to international peace and security and that the efforts of the international community should be focused on containing that threat. The request to the Conference on Disarmament to formulate principles that could serve as a framework for regional agreements on conventional arms control was therefore unfortunate, particularly at a time when the Conference would be fully stretched in the comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty negotiations and possibly in negotiations for the cessation of the production of fissile materials for weapons and nuclear explosive devices. Above all, given the fact that regional arrangements were region-specific, the exercise of the Conference on Disarmament on that issue would be futile and would merely duplicate the excellent work already done in that field by the Disarmament Commission.

52. Likewise, draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.36 largely ignored the Commission's guidelines and recommendations. For example, while the Commission's guidelines recognized that regional arrangements for disarmament and arms limitation should contribute to regional security and stability at the lowest possible level of armaments and armed forces and on the basis of undiminished security for all participating States, the draft resolution focused on the security of smaller States and contended that the enhancement thereof would reduce the risk of regional conflicts. In his view, it was more realistic to recognize that the security concerns of all States, large and small, must be equally addressed in order to reduce the risk of regional conflicts. Furthermore, the draft resolution sought to address nuclear non-proliferation at both the regional and subregional levels. His delegation believed that nuclear non-proliferation was a global issue which could only be dealt with effectively on a global basis.

53. For those reasons, his delegation would abstain on both of the draft resolutions.

54. Mr. GALVEZ (Peru) said that his delegation had withdrawn its draft decision on regional conventional disarmament (A/C.1/48/L.4) in a spirit of compromise and because the thrust of the decision was contained in draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.28 on regional disarmament, which acknowledged the importance of the Commission's guidelines and recommendations. It therefore noted with regret that a number of delegations which had supported the merging of draft decision A/C.1/48/L.4 and draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.28 also supported draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.38/Rev.1, in which some of the earlier gains had been lost. For the sake of consistency, therefore, his delegation would abstain in the vote on

(Mr. Galvez, Peru)

draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.38/Rev.1, and it reserved the right the following year to promote the adoption of a draft resolution on regional conventional arms control based on a broad consensus. The current international climate required the urgent strengthening of regional mechanisms of cooperation, confidence-building and disarmament so that the resources made available from conventional arms control at the regional level could be earmarked for priority areas of development.

55. Mr. PONCE (Ecuador) said that, while his delegation had traditionally supported all efforts to promote disarmament and confidence-building measures at the regional and subregional levels, it would abstain on the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.38/Rev.1 because the draft introduced concepts which were unclear and which ignored the consensus on regional disarmament achieved in the Disarmament Commission after several years of efforts.

Draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.28

56. Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee) said that Cape Verde, Haiti, Japan, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Panama, Slovenia, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Turkey had joined the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.28.

57. Draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.28 was adopted without a vote.

Draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.36

58. Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee) said that the sponsors of the draft resolution had been joined by Albania, Armenia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Czech Republic, Ecuador, Honduras, Malta, Netherlands, Nicaragua, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkmenistan, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Venezuela and Zimbabwe.

59. A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama,

Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: None.

Abstaining: India.

60. Draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.36 was adopted by 139 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

Draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.38/Rev.1

61. Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee) said that Haiti, Panama and Swaziland had joined the sponsors of the draft resolution.

62. A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Armenia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Egypt, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Micronesia (Federated States of), Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Slovenia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Australia, Bahamas, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Cuba, Ecuador, India, Japan, Mexico, Peru, Singapore, Slovakia, Venezuela, Viet Nam.

63. Draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.38/Rev.1 was adopted by 123 votes to none, with 15 abstentions.

64. Mr. RIVERO ROSARIO (Cuba) said that his delegation had joined in the consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.28 because the draft acknowledged the important work which had been done in the Disarmament Commission. The guidelines and recommendations elaborated by the Commission fully reflected the interests of all States, and acknowledged the link between nuclear disarmament and conventional disarmament at the global and regional levels. They also provided for participation by regional States in regional disarmament arrangements and drew attention to the danger of the excessive accumulation of weapons beyond the legitimate defence needs of a State.

65. His delegation therefore considered that it was unnecessary and even counterproductive to have introduced draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.36 on a subject which had been so comprehensively covered in the Commission's guidelines and recommendations. The draft resolution, moreover, was not balanced, since it failed to provide for initiatives and participation by all regional States in regional arrangements for disarmament. While his delegation had supported it on the grounds that it contained some useful elements, he hoped that similar drafts would in future reflect the balance that had been achieved during the negotiations in the Disarmament Commission.

66. Draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.38/Rev.1 also singled out specific aspects in an imbalanced way. His delegation could not accept certain of its provisions. Its preambular part, for example, failed to take into account the legitimate defence needs of States and the fact that the military capabilities of States needed to reflect the military capability of its potential adversaries, both regional and non-regional. Moreover, the resolution emphasized conventional arms control at the regional and subregional levels and failed to stress the need for global control of weapons of mass destruction. For those reasons his delegation had abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.38/Rev.1.

67. Mr. BERDENNIKOV (Russian Federation) said that his delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.38/Rev.1 only on the understanding that the Conference on Disarmament would work within its assigned areas of competence, in conformity with its rules and procedures. It was important to avoid a situation in which the Conference duplicated the work of the Disarmament Commission.

68. Mr. BANDURA (Ukraine) said the draft resolutions in cluster 10 had many similar elements and that efforts should be made in future to merge such drafts into a single document on regional issues.

69. The entry into force in 1992 of the Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe had proven that regional negotiations were capable of promoting regional security and disarmament. Further consultations were now necessary, however, to take account of the changed circumstances in Europe. He hoped that other countries would be understanding of Ukraine's position on that matter. While

(Mr. Bandura, Ukraine)

his country pledged to comply fully with its treaty obligations, it wished to be able to define the rational deployment of its armed forces on Ukrainian territory in accordance with the principle of reasonable sufficiency.

70. Ms. MASON (Canada) said that, while her delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.38/Rev.1, it would have voted against the fifth and sixth preambular paragraphs of the draft had separate votes been taken on those two paragraphs.

The meeting rose at 1.15 p.m.

UNITED NATIONS

General Assembly

FORTY-EIGHTH SESSION

Official Records

FIRST COMMITTEE
29th meeting
held on
Thursday, 18 November 1993
at 3 p.m.
New York

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 29th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. von WAGNER (Germany)

CONTENTS

ACTION ON DRAFT RESOLUTIONS SUBMITTED UNDER ALL DISARMAMENT AND INTERNATIONAL SECURITY AGENDA ITEMS (continued)

This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of the publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room DC2-794, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate corrigendum for each Committee.

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.1/48/SR.29
21 January 1994
ENGLISH
ORIGINAL: FRENCH

93-82516 (E)

The meeting was called to order at 3.35 p.m.

ACTION ON DRAFT RESOLUTIONS SUBMITTED UNDER ALL DISARMAMENT AND INTERNATIONAL SECURITY AGENDA ITEMS (continued) (A/C.1/48/L.3/Rev.1, L.5/Rev.1, L.11, L.26/Rev.3, L.31/Rev.1, L.43/Rev.1, L.45/Rev.1, L.49, L.50/Rev.1, L.54 and L.56)

Draft amendment to draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.45/Rev.1 (A/C.1/48/L.54)

1. Ms. MASON (Canada) announced that after consultations, the sponsors of the draft resolution had accepted the amendment proposed by India (A/C.1/48/L.54).

Draft amendment to draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.34 (A/C.1/48/L.49)

2. Mr. MARIN BOSCH (Mexico) orally revised the Mexican amendment to draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.34, issued as document A/C.1/48/L.49: in the second line, the words "the determination" should be replaced by "the wish", and the last phrase, beginning with "including" and ending with "the Convention", should be deleted.

Draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.5/Rev.1

3. Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee) announced that the Committee would proceed to vote on the eighteenth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.5/Rev.1, then on operative paragraph 8, then on operative paragraph 12, and finally on the draft resolution as a whole.

4. The eighteenth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.5/Rev.1 was adopted by 102 votes to none, with 32 abstentions.

5. Operative paragraph 8 of draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.5/Rev.1 was adopted by 110 votes to 1, with 22 abstentions.

6. Operative paragraph 10 of draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.5/Rev.1 was adopted by 95 votes to none, with 35 abstentions.

7. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to take action on the draft resolution as a whole.

8. Draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.5/Rev.1 was adopted by 136 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

9. Mr. KELLER (Germany), explaining his delegation's position, said that Germany, whose representative had for the past year been Chairman of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Prevention of an Arms Race in Outer Space, would have liked to become a sponsor of the draft resolution, but had been unable to do so because it could not reach an understanding with the sponsors on paragraph 8. The scope of the agreements was too vague, and that did not reflect the consensus which had emerged within the Ad Hoc Committee over the past year. He pointed out in addition that the last preambular paragraph, while taken from the report, was quoted out of context.

10. Mr. LEDOGAR (United States of America), speaking in explanation of vote, said that he had abstained for a number of reasons, and particularly because the United States did not recognize that there was an arms race in outer space, and therefore felt that there was no reason to consider that there was a grave danger for international peace and security. For the same reason, the United States could not accept the fourteenth preambular paragraph. Regarding the eleventh preambular paragraph, the task of the Ad Hoc Committee was to negotiate. As to operative paragraph 10, it should have been deleted, because it was totally out of date.

11. Mr. ERRERA (France), speaking in explanation of vote, recalled that in 1992 France had co-sponsored the draft resolution on the prevention of an arms race in outer space, because it had included a paragraph emphasizing confidence-building measures. In 1993, the work of the Ad Hoc Committee conducted under the leadership of the representative of Germany had placed the emphasis on the search for such measures, the only area in which a consensus could have emerged. It would have been desirable for the draft resolution to give a better reflection of the Committee's work. Accordingly, France had proposed a draft relating to the eighteenth preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 8, but it had not been taken into account. His delegation had thus abstained in the vote on those two paragraphs.

Draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.26/Rev.3

12. Draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.26/Rev.3 was adopted without a vote.

Draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.43/Rev.1

13. The CHAIRMAN, after announcing that Mauritania had agreed to withdraw the amendment it had proposed at the previous meeting, invited the Committee to adopt the draft resolution without a vote.

14. Draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.43/Rev.1 was adopted without a vote.

15. Mr. DANIELI (Israel), explaining his position after the decision, said that he had not wished to dissociate himself from the consensus, but that he had reservations regarding paragraphs 6 and 10, which in his view were out of place in the resolution.

16. Mr. GÜYEN (Turkey) pointed out that the resolution just adopted referred, in particular in paragraph 6, to meetings in which Turkey had not participated. Accordingly, his delegation wished to clarify that the fact that it had joined the consensus did not mean that it subscribed to all the decisions taken at the meetings in question.

Draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.3/Rev.1

17. Mr. PERRI (Brazil), introducing the draft resolution on behalf of the sponsors, explained its broad outlines and read out its most important provisions.

18. At the request of a delegation, a recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.3/Rev.1.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: None.

Abstaining: United States of America.

19. The draft resolution was adopted by 139 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

20. Mr. LEDOGAR (United States of America), speaking in explanation of vote, said that as the sponsors of the draft resolution had changed the formulation of paragraph 12 in a way which tended to prejudge the results of the Conference on Disarmament, the United States had been compelled to abstain in the vote.

Proposed amendment to draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.11

21. The CHAIRMAN said that with a view to overcoming the difficulties that stood in the way of consensus adoption of draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.11, he had suggested the addition to the eighth preambular paragraph of the phrase "in accordance with article 11 of the Convention". He urged delegations to seek a compromise with a view to arriving at a consensus on the two texts under consideration.

Draft amendment to draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.31/Rev.1 (A/C.1/48/L.56)

22. Mr. RIVERO (Cuba) said that, as the two proposed amendments to draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.31/Rev.1 it had put forward had not been accepted by the sponsors, his delegation was putting them formally before the Committee in document A/C.1/48/L.56. He pointed out nevertheless that that document contained not the Cuban amendments themselves, but the text which would result from their acceptance.

The meeting rose at 4.45 p.m.

UNITED NATIONS

General Assembly

FORTY-EIGHTH SESSION

Official Records

FIRST COMMITTEE
30th meeting
held on
Friday, 19 November 1993
at 10 a.m.
New York

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE FIRST PART* OF THE 30th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. von WAGNER (Germany)

CONTENTS

CONSIDERATION OF ALL DRAFT RESOLUTIONS SUBMITTED UNDER ALL DISARMAMENT AND INTERNATIONAL SECURITY AGENDA ITEMS (continued)

* The summary record of the second part of the meeting to be reconvened on Friday, 19 November 1993, at 3 p.m., appears as document A/C.1/48/SR.30/Add.1.

This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of the publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room DC2-794, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate corrigendum for each Committee.

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.1/48/SR.30
13 January 1994

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

93-82534 (E)

The meeting was called to order at 10.30 a.m.

CONSIDERATION OF ALL DRAFT RESOLUTIONS SUBMITTED UNDER ALL DISARMAMENT AND INTERNATIONAL SECURITY AGENDA ITEMS (continued)

Draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.25

1. Mr. WISNUMURTI (Indonesia), speaking on behalf of the non-aligned countries, said that although nuclear weapons had added a frightening dimension to the potential for world catastrophe, the major powers had shown callous disregard for the global consequences of their use, which would threaten the very survival of nations.

2. Since a legally binding international instrument had never been ratified, existing arsenals continued to pose a threat to mankind. The possibility that nuclear weapons might be used as an expression of a political decision was frightening, and disaster caused by technical malfunction, misinformation or human error was an ever-present concern. The current situation could not continue, and the question of the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons had acquired increasing urgency in multilateral negotiations. The fact that the legal implications of nuclear weapons had yet to be addressed had prompted the non-aligned countries to submit draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.25.

3. However, they recognized that recent developments in the sphere of disarmament made the attainment of the complete elimination of nuclear weapons a more likely prospect. The progress achieved under the auspices of the Amendment Conference and the Conference on Disarmament had, moreover, facilitated the adoption by the Committee of consensus resolutions on a comprehensive test-ban and a ban on the production of fissionable materials which might lead to renunciation of the use of nuclear weapons. To preserve the momentum of the progress being made, the non-aligned countries had therefore decided not to press for final action on draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.25 but would continue instead to monitor developments in different forums, with particular interest in the early conclusion of a comprehensive test ban treaty (CTBT).

Draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.41

4. Draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.41 was adopted without a vote.

5. Sir Michael WESTON (United Kingdom), supported by Mr. MADDEN (United States of America), noted that comment on paragraph 6 of the resolution just adopted contained a request for additional support services for negotiations on the resolution. He recognized that the Conference on Disarmament would have a heavy workload during its 1994 session, but in view of the financial constraints facing the United Nations, he hoped all additional costs of any tasks of the Conference should be met by redeployment of existing resources.

6. Mr. BANDURA (Ukraine) said that his Government intended to obtain full status in the Conference on Disarmament, and his delegation welcomed the inclusion in the resolution of provision for expanded membership. The decision taken by the Conference on Disarmament to give its Ad Hoc Committee on a Nuclear Test-Ban a mandate to negotiate a CTBT necessitated the inclusion of States capable of making constructive contributions. His delegation supported paragraph 6, since additional resources would be required to meet the costs of the Conference's future expanded membership.

7. Mr. SVOBODA (Czech Republic) said his delegation's co-sponsorship of the draft resolution was the expression of its interest in the activities of the Conference on Disarmament and extension of its membership.

Draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.40

8. Mr. SVOBODA (Czech Republic), speaking in explanation of position, said that on 5 October 1993, the seismological stations in the Czech Republic had recorded a Chinese underground nuclear test equivalent to an earthquake of 5.8 on the Richter scale. It was unfortunate that explosions of that magnitude were continuing, and a comprehensive nuclear test ban treaty was long overdue. The international community would appreciate moderation with regard to the conduct of tests, and an early start on CTBT negotiations in the Conference on Disarmament. Czech experts would continue to participate in the Ad Hoc Group of Scientific Experts to Consider International Cooperative Measures to Detect and Identify Seismic Events. Though only an observer to the Conference on Disarmament, the Czech Republic intended to contribute its seismological know-how to the global cooperative effort to ensure reliable detection of tests. His Government supported efforts towards a treaty banning nuclear weapons, and felt that the Conference's Committee on a Nuclear Test-Ban would be able to achieve substantive progress in 1994.

9. Draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.40 was adopted without a vote.

10. Mr. O'SULLIVAN (Australia), speaking in explanation of position, said that the consensus decision just taken was historic for two reasons: it was the culmination of years of work, and it reflected a series of nuclear arms reduction and nuclear testing initiatives by France, the Russian Federation and the United States. The process had required political commitment, foresight and courage.

11. When he had introduced the resolution on 8 November 1993, more than 100 Member States had been sponsors of the resolution, and that had indicated broad commitment to a ban on nuclear testing. The number of sponsors had since risen to 156, a figure which was unprecedented in the history of the First Committee, or the General Assembly and showed that the atmosphere for successful negotiations on a CTBT had never been more propitious.

12. Sir Michael WESTON (United Kingdom) said that he welcomed the decision of the Conference on Disarmament to give its Ad Hoc Committee on a Nuclear Test Ban a mandate to negotiate a CTBT. He also realized that the complexity of some of the issues might necessitate intersessional meetings. However, since support services had been provided during the negotiations on the 1992 Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production, Stockpiling and Use of Chemical Weapons and on their Destruction without additional services like those requested in the resolution just passed, his delegation did not understand the need for two more staff members as proposed in the programme budget implications statement. Given the financial situation of the United Nations, he hoped that any additional costs would be met by redeployment of existing resources.

13. Mr. HOU Zhitong (China) said that his Government was prepared to work with other countries on a CTBT, and had accordingly supported the consensus adoption of the draft resolution.

14. Nuclear disarmament and a nuclear test ban were, however, principally the responsibility of those countries with the largest nuclear arsenals. China believed that negotiations on the issue of non-first-use of nuclear weapons against non-nuclear-weapon States should also be conducted, and international agreements on the subject concluded. His Government would play an active role in the CTBT negotiations.

15. Mr. WISNUMURTI (Indonesia) said that the Member States of the Non-Aligned Movement Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons welcomed the consensus adoption of draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.40. It was the first time that the United Nations had reached consensus on the conclusion of a comprehensive nuclear test ban treaty. He hoped that the Conference on Disarmament would conclude such a treaty before the end of the 1994 session, since that would influence the outcome of the 1995 review and extension conference of the Nuclear Test-Ban Treaty.

16. Mr. LAVINA (Philippines) concurred with the statements of the representatives of Australia, Indonesia and the Czech Republic.

17. Mr. HAN Toe Song (Democratic People's Republic of Korea) said that his Government had consistently supported the ban on tests, production, stockpiling and use of nuclear weapons and that it welcomed the decision of the Disarmament Conference to give its Ad Hoc Committee on a Nuclear Test Ban a mandate to negotiate a universal verifiable treaty as one of the most effective ways to achieve nuclear disarmament.

18. None the less, practical measures on the part of all nuclear-weapons States were even more important than a ban. If those States eliminated their nuclear weapons on a step-by-step basis, that would assure the non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of such weapons. For that reason, his Government wished to raise the issue of nuclear weapons deployed in foreign countries. His delegation had supported the resolution just adopted, in the hope that it would contribute to the elimination of all nuclear weapons.

19. Mr. BATIOUK (Ukraine) informed the Committee that on 18 November 1993 the Ukrainian Parliament, in a historic action, had ratified the Treaty on the Reduction and Limitation of Strategic Offensive Arms (START I) and the Lisbon Protocol by an overwhelming majority. During the debate members of the Parliament had expressed concern on a number of points, including the need to retain a deterrence capability at a time when the security and territorial integrity of Ukraine were under threat and the need to ensure environmental security during the process of reducing nuclear weapon stockpiles. Some members of Parliament had expressed regret that the promises of outside financial assistance in meeting the costs involved in the destruction of nuclear weapons were incommensurable with the needs, and that security assurances had not been given to Ukraine; concern had also been expressed regarding the environmental safety of the situation with regard to the thousands of nuclear weapons transported to the Russian Federation in 1992. A number of reservations had therefore been incorporated into the resolution ratifying the two agreements. Nevertheless, the action taken was a first step by Ukraine. After reading out the text of the resolution, including the reservations, he expressed the hope that other nuclear-weapon States would join the Russian Federation and Ukraine in reducing the number of their nuclear weapons.

20. The CHAIRMAN expressed the hope, on behalf of the Committee, that the action just announced was a first step by Ukraine towards accession to the Non-Proliferation Treaty.

21. Mr. BERDENNIKOV (Russian Federation) said it was the firm position of the Russian Federation that treaties must be implemented in full and that partial or selective implementation was totally impermissible.

Draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.19

22. Draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.19 was adopted without a vote.

23. Sir Michael WESTON (United Kingdom) said that his delegation had been happy to join the consensus on the draft resolution. A carefully prepared and well-drafted treaty on the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in Africa, if acceptable to all States in the region, would be an important contribution to the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons and to international peace and security. Given the difficult financial climate facing the United Nations, his delegation had been pleased to note from the statement of programme budget implications that the additional cost of the meetings involved was to be met by redeployment of existing resources.

Draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.6

24. A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic,

Ecuador, Egypt, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: United States of America.

Abstaining: United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

25. Draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.6 was adopted by 141 votes to 1, with 1 abstention.

26. Sir Michael WESTON (United Kingdom), explaining his delegation's abstention in the vote on the draft resolution, said that the United Kingdom strongly supported regional confidence-building measures in principle and also firmly supported regional initiatives such as the Standing Advisory Committee on Security Questions in Central Africa. However, it was its view that the costs associated with the implementation of the draft resolution should be borne by the participants in the programme, supplemented if necessary by voluntary contributions, and that recourse should not be had to the United Nations regular budget. Additionally, it noted that the call for two meetings to be held in Brazzaville and Luanda in 1994, for which an exception would have to be made to the Headquarters principle, was inconsistent with General Assembly resolution 40/243. No problem would arise, of course, if the costs of the meetings were borne, as they should be, by participants or by voluntary contributions.

27. Mr. MADDEN (United States of America) said that his delegation supported the concept of regional confidence-building measures and was pleased to see such an initiative undertaken by the African States. When the corresponding draft resolution had been submitted to the First Committee in 1991, the United States had been informed that all future costs would be borne by the participants themselves or through voluntary contributions and, on that understanding, had joined the consensus on the draft resolution. It had been disappointed to learn, in 1992, that, contrary to what had been promised, funds would be sought from the United Nations regular budget to cover the costs of the Standing Advisory Committee, and had voted against the draft resolution submitted in

(Mr. Madden, United States)

1992 because of the recurrent, increasing and significant budgetary implications.

28. The United States had been hopeful that the current year's draft resolution would reflect the original intention of the sponsors to have the Standing Advisory Committee funded through voluntary contributions and regional arrangements. That was not the case, and therefore the United States had voted against the draft resolution on financial grounds. If, in the future, funding could be achieved outside of the regular United Nations budget, the United States would again be happy to support the draft resolution.

29. Mr. ONAGA (Gabon), speaking on behalf of the members of the Economic Community of Central African States, thanked the delegations which had voted in favour of the draft resolution. Its sponsors understood the concern of some States, in a time of budgetary constraint for the United Nations, not to incur additional financial obligations, and interpreted their votes not as a rejection of the substance of the draft resolution but as a desire to save money for the Organization. However, the sponsors of the draft resolution shared the views expressed on the importance of regional disarmament measures by the representatives of Canada and Pakistan during the Committee's consideration of draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.28, and would remind the Committee that in proposing the draft resolution just voted on, its sponsors had intended to emphasize their determination to promote disarmament and non-proliferation in the subregion of Central Africa as well as to affirm the value of preventive diplomacy.

Draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.45/Rev.1

30. Ms. MASON (Canada) said that the draft resolution's sponsors had considered the amendment proposed by India (A/C.1/48/L.54) and had agreed to delete the words "at the global, regional and local levels" in the third preambular paragraph and in operative paragraph 2 (a).

31. Mr. KUMAR (India) said that as his delegation's amendment had been partially accepted, it had joined the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.45/Rev.1.

32. Mr. MADDEN (United States of America), speaking in explanation of vote before the vote, said that his delegation intended to abstain. While the United States did not dispute the importance of verification in arms control and disarmament, particularly for the negotiation and implementation of the relevant agreements, it objected to the in-depth study on verification proposed in paragraph 2 of the draft resolution on a number of grounds. First, the launching of a new study before the results of the 1990 study had been properly evaluated seemed premature. Furthermore, only two replies had been received in the light of General Assembly resolution 47/45, which hardly indicated enthusiastic support for the proposed study. Second, the proposed examination of the results of recent United Nations experience on verification was unacceptable, particularly in the case of the Special Commission on Iraq, which, in the view of his delegation, was at a critical stage of its work. The United States also questioned the advisability of launching a United Nations study that might entail a review of Security Council actions. Third, in view of the

(Mr. Madden, United States)

current budgetary constraints, and the increasing financial burden of expanded peacemaking peace-keeping operations, any unnecessary expense should be avoided. Lastly, he wondered who would be providing the proposed group of experts with lessons on recent United Nations experience in verification and other international developments. More important, the actual relevance of experience gained in one very specific field, such as the work of the Special Commission on Iraq, in the broader context of arms control and other United Nations activities was questionable. In any case, the results of the work of that Commission should in the first instance be evaluated by the body itself.

33. Mr. PERRI (Brazil), expressing support for the draft resolution, said that since the completion of the study on the role of the United Nations in the field of verification in 1990 a number of significant events, including the conclusion of the Chemical Weapons Convention and the work of the Ad Hoc Group of Governmental Experts to Identify and Examine Possible Verification Measures from a Scientific and Technical Standpoint (the VEREX process), had highlighted the importance of verification and pointed to the need for a new and comprehensive study on the subject. He therefore applauded the initiative taken by the delegation of Canada and hoped that the draft resolution would receive the broad support of the international community.

34. Mr. GUILLAUME (Belgium) said that the 12 member States of the European Union intended to abstain from the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.45/Rev.1. He stressed the importance the Twelve attached to all aspects of verification as a means of ensuring international peace and security through mutual trust and compliance with international agreements on arms control and disarmament. However, as only three years had elapsed since the completion of the last United Nations study on verification, it seemed premature to entrust a group of experts with new tasks, which would not only have financial implications but also entail an additional burden for the Secretariat. As to the scope of the proposed study, it was premature to draw conclusions on the verification aspects of disarmament agreements and activities under way such as those of the Special Commission on Iraq. Moreover, it was inappropriate to deal with verification matters in the abstract, without taking due account of specific treaties and regimes or appropriate forums already in existence. Lastly, with regard to the prevention of conflict and handling of crises, the increasingly important role of regional arrangements must not be overlooked.

35. Ms. MASON (Canada), responding to the comments made, recalled that when introducing the draft resolution she had explained in detail why a new study on verification had been deemed timely. She failed to understand how it could be considered premature to update a study which had been carried out during, and largely based on the needs of, the cold war era. Of the three replies that had been received in connection with the follow-up to that study, one had been on behalf of the 12 member States of the European Community.

36. As to the remarks regarding the United Nations Special Commission on Iraq, she reiterated that the purpose of the study was to examine the tools of verification and practical lessons to be drawn and not the circumstances under which arms control obligations to be verified had come into effect. The Under-Secretary-General for Political Affairs had himself observed that recent United

(Ms. Mason, Canada)

Nations experience, in particular that of the Special Commission, could provide useful input on the methodology of verification and monitoring activities. It was hoped that the proposed study would provide a sound basis for constructive debate in other forums on the role the United Nations had to play in verification matters.

37. Mr. MARIN BOSCH (Mexico) endorsed the Canadian representative's remarks, and said that in spite of the many efforts made, only modest progress had so far been achieved in strengthening the role of the United Nations in the field of verification. While he appreciated the statements made by the representatives of Belgium and the United States, he expressed the hope that all other delegations would lend their full support to the draft resolution.

38. Mr. BERDENNIKOV (Russian Federation), speaking on a point of order, drew attention to the last sentence of rule 128 of the Rules of Procedure.

39. The CHAIRMAN said that he had allowed the representative of Canada to make her statement, since he had not considered it as an explanation of vote. A separate vote had been requested on paragraph 2 of the draft resolution.

40. A separate vote was taken on paragraph 2 of draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.45/Rev.1, as orally revised.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Mongolia, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Belgium, Denmark, France, Germany, Luxembourg, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Kuwait, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Malta, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Spain.

41. Paragraph 2, as orally revised, was adopted by 120 votes to 7, with 14 abstentions.

42. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.45/Rev.1 as a whole, as orally revised.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Lithuania, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against. None.

Abstaining: Belgium, Denmark, France, Germany, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Malta, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Spain, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

43. Draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.45/Rev.1 as a whole, as orally revised, was adopted by 127 votes to none, with 19 abstentions.

Draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.11

44. The CHAIRMAN recalled that the lengthy consultations held with a view to consolidating the draft resolution contained in A/C.1/48/L.11 and the revised amendment proposed in A/C.1/48/L.50/Rev.1 had proved unsuccessful and that he had therefore suggested a further amendment to the eighth preambular paragraph of the draft resolution in order to obviate the need for a vote.

45. Mr. MEHR (Islamic Republic of Iran) said that it had not been clear when the Chairman made his suggestion that it constituted an amendment on which action would be subsequently taken.

46. Mr. DANKWA (Ghana), while appreciating the efforts to facilitate the work of the Committee made by the Chairman, said that it was not appropriate for him to make formal proposals before the Committee, which was the prerogative of representatives.

47. The CHAIRMAN said he believed he had clearly indicated that his suggestion was intended to facilitate the work of the Committee by ensuring the adoption of the draft resolution by consensus.

48. Mr. WAGENMAKERS (Netherlands) commended the initiative of the Chairman, which judging from the informal consultations held, seemed to meet with the approval of the majority of delegations. On the basis of the Chairman's suggestion, he proposed the insertion of the words "in accordance with article 11 of the Convention" at the end of the eighth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.11, and further requested that his proposal should be put to the vote forthwith.

49. Mr. MARIN BOSCH (Mexico) said it was clear that the Chairman's original suggestion would not achieve the desired effect - namely to avoid a vote. He therefore suggested that the Committee should delay no further and either take a decision or prolong consultations on the revised amendment proposed in document A/C.1/48/L.50/Rev.1.

50. Mr. DANKWA (Ghana), referring to rule 130 of the Rules of Procedure, proposed that a vote should first be taken on the revised amendment submitted by the delegation of the Islamic Republic of Iran, since it was further removed in substance from the original proposal contained in document A/C.1/48/L.11.

51. Mr. KAMAL (Pakistan) said many member countries of the Non-Aligned Movement had sponsored the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/48/L.11 in the hope that the First Committee would take a unanimous stance on the crucial issue of chemical and bacteriological (biological) weapons. Many of them, however, also felt that the revised amendment proposed by the Islamic Republic of Iran was consistent with the terms of article 11 of the Chemical Weapons Convention; it was therefore difficult to understand why its insertion in draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.11 should have given rise to such problems. Every effort should be made to seek a compromise solution; however, in the event of a vote, his delegation would vote in favour of the revised amendment contained in document A/C.1/48/L.50/Rev.1. He questioned the procedural implications of the representative of the Netherlands proposing an amendment to his own draft resolution without first consulting the other sponsors. It was important, however, not to sacrifice discussion on the substance of the draft resolution to procedural matters.

52. Mr. MEHR (Islamic Republic of Iran) sought clarification regarding the status of the proposal made by the representative of the Netherlands and wondered whether 24 hours should not elapse before any action was taken on it.

53. Mr. WAGENMAKERS (Netherlands), noting the need for swift implementation of the Chemical Weapons Convention, stressed that he had made his proposal in the interests of security and disarmament. He then sought clarification regarding the order of voting on the amendments proposed.

54. The CHAIRMAN said that the question raised by the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran was answered in the third sentence of rule 120 of the rules of procedure. As to the order in which the proposals should be taken up, he was advised by the Legal Counsel that rule 130 of the rules of procedure was applicable; since the amendment in document A/C.1/48/L.50/Rev.1 was further removed from the original draft resolution, it should have priority over the proposal by the representative of the Netherlands.

55. Mr. WAGENMAKERS (Netherlands) recalled that at the 25th meeting, the Chairman had made a ruling that the consideration of draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.11 and the amendment in document A/C.1/48/L.50 would be postponed; in a spirit of compromise and flexibility, his delegation had entered into consultations on the wording of the draft resolution. Unfortunately, it had become apparent that the purpose of the amendment was to change the whole basis of the original understanding incorporated in the Convention itself, and that was clearly unacceptable. He therefore wished to inform the Committee that the delegations of Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Costa Rica, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Korea, Romania, the Russian Federation, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Turkey, the United Kingdom and the United States of America, as well as his own delegation, would withdraw their sponsorship of draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.11 in the eventuality that the Iranian amendment was adopted by the Committee. That would be a major decision, and would reflect the great importance those States had always attached to the Chemical Weapons Convention. The draft resolution was purely procedural in nature; the States in question could not agree to an amendment that was contrary to and incompatible with the provisions of the Chemical Weapons Convention, which had been signed by over 150 States and endorsed by the General Assembly in resolution 47/39, adopted by consensus.

56. He proposed that no action should be taken on the amendment in document A/C.1/48/L.50/Rev.1.

57. After a discussion in which Mr. MORADI (Islamic Republic of Iran), Ms. MASON (Canada) and Mr. DANKWA (Ghana) took part, Ms. MASON (Canada) said that she was in favour of the motion to take no action on the amendment in document A/C.1/48/L.50/Rev.1. Her delegation and the Polish delegation had traditionally introduced the draft resolution on the Chemical Weapons Convention over the many years of negotiations and up to the time when the draft Convention was completed. The Iranian amendment introduced substance into a procedural draft resolution and did not accurately reflect what had been so arduously negotiated in Geneva. Therefore, it could not form a basis for consensus. If the motion for adjournment failed, her delegation and many others would vote against the Iranian amendment and, if that amendment was adopted, against the draft resolution as a whole. That situation could be avoided since there was a basis for consensus in the Netherlands proposal.

58. Mr. ZALESKI (Poland) said that Poland, as one of the leading participants in the negotiations on the Chemical Weapons Convention, supported the motion not to take action on the Iranian amendment. His delegation had serious reservations about that amendment because it introduced substantive elements into a procedural draft resolution and did not accurately reflect the carefully balanced text of article 11 of the Chemical Weapons Convention. Those reservations were shared by a number of the other sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.11. As a result, if the Iranian amendment was adopted, the traditional sponsors of draft resolutions on the Chemical Weapons Convention would be forced to withdraw and would vote against draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.11. That situation could be avoided.

59. Mr. MORADI (Islamic Republic of Iran) said that his delegation was opposed to the motion to take no action on its amendment. It felt that the draft resolution was substantive and that the eighth preambular paragraph touched upon article 11 of the Chemical Weapons Convention in a selective way, without any reference to the need for the removal of restrictions which lay at the heart of that article. Indeed, the whole draft resolution took a selective approach to the Convention. The language used in the amendment was consistent with the Convention, and had been proposed by some of the Western sponsors of the draft resolution in the course of the failed consultations. His delegation would regard votes against the draft resolution as a whole as votes against the Convention itself.

60. Mr. DANKWA (Ghana) said that his delegation was also opposed to the motion for no action on the amendment. Ghana, a developing country, had no chemical weapons, but it had signed the Chemical Weapons Convention as a demonstration of its support for the idea that such weapons should be removed from the face of the earth and to reassure the group of countries that were trying to impose restrictions on the transfer of technology that it had no intention of developing chemical weapons. The motion for adjournment revealed an intention to perpetuate discrimination in international relations. The purpose of the draft resolution was to encourage a larger number of States to ratify the Convention. The Iranian amendment was important as an assurance by the international community that the adoption of the Convention was not intended to deny access to technology.

61. Mr. GUILLAUME (Brazil), speaking on a point of order, said that his delegation supported the draft resolution and believed that everyone in the Committee supported it. He therefore called on the Chairman, under rule 118 of the rules of procedure, to suspend the meeting so that a last effort could be made to reach consensus on the draft resolution.

62. The CHAIRMAN said that under rule 119 of the rules of procedure, the motion to suspend the meeting had precedence over the motion to take no action on the amendment.

63. The motion to suspend the meeting was adopted by 122 votes to 31.

The meeting was suspended at 1 p.m.

UNITED NATIONS

General Assembly

FORTY-EIGHTH SESSION

Official Records

FIRST COMMITTEE
31st meeting
held on
Friday, 19 November 1993
at 6 p.m.
New York

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 31st MEETING

Chairman: Mr. von WAGNER (Germany)

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 156: RATIONALIZATION OF THE WORK AND REFORM OF THE AGENDA OF THE FIRST COMMITTEE (continued)

This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of the publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room DC2-794, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate corrigendum for each Committee.

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.1/48/SR.31
26 January 1994
ENGLISH
ORIGINAL: FRENCH

93-82564 (E)

The meeting was called to order at 6.05 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 156: RATIONALIZATION OF THE WORK AND REFORM OF THE AGENDA OF THE FIRST COMMITTEE (continued) (A/C.1/48/L.51)

1. The CHAIRMAN, referring to agenda item 156, entitled "Rationalization of the work and reform of the agenda of the First Committee", drew attention to draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.51 and invited the members of the Committee to comment on it.

2. Mr. THANARAJASINGAM (Malaysia) asked the Chairman to confirm that the First Committee would continue to consider agenda item 76 within the broad topic area "International security".

3. The CHAIRMAN confirmed that that was indeed the case.

4. Mr. DZVAIRO (Zimbabwe) took note of the Chairman's answer and thanked the representative of Malaysia for having asked the question.

5. Mr. EL TINAY (Sudan), speaking on behalf of the Group of Arab States, said that the members of the Group considered that the question of Israeli nuclear armament should be considered by the First Committee within the broad topic area "Regional disarmament and security".

6. Mr. DANKWA (Ghana) said that in his delegation's view, the second subparagraph of paragraph 1 of the draft resolution under consideration was designed to ensure that the First Committee did not spend time on a sterile general debate and was linked to paragraph 2 in such a way that the agenda items which could be clustered within the broad topic areas referred to in that paragraph would likewise benefit from the "more detailed and focused discussion". He also noted that the Chairman had confirmed that the question of Antarctica would be addressed within the broad topic area "International security".

7. Mr. DANIELI (Israel) said that the question of Israeli nuclear armament did not belong on the agenda of the First Committee.

8. Mr. EL TINAY (Sudan) recalled that the Committee had adopted draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.48, the last paragraph of which stated that the question of Israeli nuclear armament would be included in the agenda of the forty-ninth session of the General Assembly.

9. The CHAIRMAN suggested that draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.51 should be adopted without a vote. If there was no objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to adopt the draft resolution.

10. It was so decided.

11. Mr. LAVINA (Philippines) said he welcomed the practice which had enabled the Chairman to submit a draft resolution. The Chairman was to be commended for the efforts he had made in that connection.

12. Mr. COLLINS (Ireland) said that he welcomed the adoption of the draft resolution, even though he would have liked the Committee to go further. His delegation was among those which attached the greatest importance to disarmament and international security, but considered that having a Main Committee devote itself to those topics would not necessarily ensure that they were given priority in the hierarchy of important matters with which the United Nations had to deal. His delegation also thought that the General Assembly should have a general political committee, which should preferably be the First Committee. Since the General Assembly intended to take up some of the ideas in the Chairman's paper of 3 November, they could be considered in the body established for that purpose, namely the informal open-ended working group on the revitalization of the General Assembly. His delegation also noted that the First Committee was hesitant about tackling the admittedly difficult domain of political questions.

13. Mr. GUILLAUME (Belgium), speaking on behalf of the States members of the European Union, said that at the resumed session of the First Committee in March 1992 the Twelve had shown their interest in rationalization by circulating a working paper on the subject. They attached great importance to the question and in line with resolution 47/54 G had pursued their course by requesting the inclusion in the agenda of the current session of the item under consideration. At the beginning of that session, the members of the European Union had produced a "non-paper" outlining their ideas. The non-aligned countries had done the same and other suggestions had followed. A working group had met for two weeks and all participants were to be congratulated on the constructive spirit they had shown. Among all the debates at the current session, the one in the working group could be cited as an example of a fruitful dialogue that had produced constructive results. Special gratitude was due to the Netherlands delegation, which had made a valuable contribution to the work.

14. Draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.51 had been adopted by consensus and the First Committee should now have the tool it needed to help the Chairman direct its work. It was perhaps only a first step, but it was a significant one. In any case, it was an important prerequisite for the continued improvement of the First Committee's work.

15. The CHAIRMAN said he agreed with the representative of Belgium that the adoption of draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.51 was a step in the right direction, although he agreed with the representative of Ireland that the Committee could, perhaps, have gone further. The text was a solid basis for future action. Encouraged by the delegation of Ireland and feeling that it might be acceptable to delegations, he had taken the initiative of circulating in the same form the notes he had circulated at the beginning of November, accompanied by a brief covering note (A/C.1/48/9). That document did not call for a decision, but was designed solely to provide delegations with food for thought on ways of reforming the First Committee so as to make it more effective.

(The Chairman)

16. In the course of his consultations on the subject with many delegations, most had advocated a change in the organization of the Committee's work which was unrelated to the rationalization envisaged in the draft resolution just adopted, which related to the programme of work. In a paper dated 19 November which was to be circulated, he had taken the initiative of setting forth a number of ideas which delegations might ponder at the informal meetings that might be devoted to the Committee's programme of work at future sessions of the General Assembly. The paper took into account the widely held view that the time available to the Committee should be spent in the most rational and structured way possible. The paper could serve as the basis for the consultations which he intended to organize in 1994, subject to the agreement of his Government possibly during the session of the Disarmament Commission. It set forth a possible approach to the organization of the Committee's work and the proposals it contained were examples only and in no way prejudged future organizational requirements, such as the number of meetings allocated to the Committee. The rest of the paper reproduced wishes expressed by a large number of delegations during his consultations to which no objections had been raised thus far. They would be considered during the consultations he was requested to hold under paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.51.

The meeting rose at 6.30 p.m.